



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,996	01/22/2004	Hideo Nakaya	450100-04889	6199

7590 08/10/2007  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
745 FIFTH AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

KOSTAK, VICTOR R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/10/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/762,996	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NAKAYA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Victor R. Kostak	<b>Art Unit</b> 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

Art Unit: 2622

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Note MPEP 606.01.
2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmidt  
(7,142,882).

Schmidt (noting Fig. 1) discloses an integrated chip 100 comprising plural functional blocks 151, 153, 155, 170 and 190 within composite reconfigurable processing core 150 (col. 3 lines 50-63). The functionality of at least one block can be changed (reconfigured) by “setting” (it not being clear that the term “setting” is intended to be a noun or a verb, regardless), thereby meeting claim 1.

As for claim 2, (at least one of) a first functional block (ASIC or CPU or the DSP) selects a part of an information data (the data being image data obtained by CCD 228 (Fig. 2) in compressed form (col. 7 lines 64-67) that comprises multiple items of the information data

Art Unit: 2622

(namely multiple coefficients of multiple levels of DCTs: col. 3 line 58), the information data covering the entire two-dimensional image generated by the CCD, which therefore includes the periphery of the “target position.” A second block (one blocks 151, 153 and 155) performs processing on the selected DCT values from the first block, ultimately to transmit the image data form remote reception (noting antenna 232 in Fig. 2).

As for claim 3, the first functional block changes (at least part of) the multiple data items of the information (image) data according to the setting (namely the DCTs to be used that correspond to the particular image section transferred to the processing stages from the CCD, or other transforms or coefficient data types altogether, as is expressly allowed by Schmidt: col. 3 lines 55-63).

Regarding claim 4, the second functional block (e.g. one of the DSPs), can operate such that the contents of the data to be processed can be changed (at least since new or updated image data is transferred thereto from CCD 228) according to the operational setting of the processing core 150.

As for claim 5, the information (image) signal is comprised of pixel data (later transformed into DCT coefficients for compression processing).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt.

As noted above, Schmidt arranges plural duplicate CPUs 151, plural duplicate DSPs 153, and plural duplicate ASICs 155, all on the same IC 100. The information (image) data is converted from pixel values into DCT coefficients for reduced-bandwidth transmission processing.

The first and second (and any subsequent) processing portion operate on compressed image data in the DCT domain, that includes the peripheral image data and the non-peripheral image data constituting the entire image, ultimately to generate a second information signal (i.e. the image signal reproduced for display), as discussed previously. The multiple items processed by the first portion correspond to the specific DCT values which are typically arranged in a hierarchical set beginning with the DC value of the first image block (and originally retrieved from a slice typical in MPEG compression coding).

Since the typically-used MPEG compression involves a hierarchical range of DCT coefficients, and since Schmidt includes as many identical DSP stages and CPU stages for processing, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to consider the hierarchical levels of the DCTs as classes of DCT, each respective processor operating on its level or class (which can be changed as well), processed for transmission. Such is further suggested by Schmidt as he points out that processors 151 and 153 can be configured to operate optimally on specific problems (col. 3 lines 55-56), further points out that dedicated hardware can be incorporated per ASIC 155 (lines 58-61), and that the number of active processors is controlled depending on the application (lines 61-62).

The first and second portions (either the CPU stages or the DSP stages) are identical, as disclosed, thereby meeting claim 6.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6. Claims 7-14 appear allowable over the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor R. Kostak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7348. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2622

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**Or faxed to:**

**(571) 273-8300**

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 308-HELP.



Victor R. Kostak  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2622

VRK